**FILED** 

## **NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**AUG 01 2006** 

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

## FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

EVA QUIROZ-TORRES,

Petitioner,

V.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 05-74206

Agency No. A76-844-644

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted July 24, 2006 \*\*

Before: ALARCÓN, HAWKINS, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Eva Quiroz-Torres, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying her motion to reopen removal proceedings. We dismiss the petition for review.

The evidence Quiroz-Torres presented with her motion to reopen concerned the same basic hardship grounds as her application for cancellation of removal. *See Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 602-03 (9th Cir. 2006). We therefore lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's discretionary determination that the evidence was insufficient to establish a prima facie case of hardship. *See id.* at 601 (holding that if "the BIA determines that a motion to reopen proceedings in which there has already been an unreviewable discretionary determination concerning a statutory prerequisite to relief does not make out a prima facie case for that relief," 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(I) bars this court from revisiting the merits).

Quiroz-Torres' contention that the BIA engaged in fact-finding is not supported by the record and does not amount to a colorable due process claim. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005) ("[t]raditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction.").

## PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.